Illinois Early Learning Council
Space Capacity Committee
May 26th 2:00 – 4:00 pm
33 W. Monroe, Suite 2400, Chicago, IL
1 W. Old State Capitol Plaza, Myers Building, Suite 716 - Springfield

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present: Shannon Christian, Kim Collins, Craig Duetsch, Mario Garcia, Ireta Gasner (videoconference), Refugio Gonzalez, Mary Griffith (phone), Mark McHugh (phone), Carol Morris (phone), Sessy Nyman (videoconference), Tony Raden (co-chair), Olivia Roanhorse (staffer), Kelly Talbot (phone), Samir Tanna, Dawn Thomas, Martin Torres, Gregory Will (phone).

Absent: Cindy Bardeleben, Jose Cerda, Rebecca Deang, Laura Frichtl, Kay Henderson, Nakisha Hobbs, Holly Knicker, Dave Lowitzki, Kelly Magnuson, Giacomo Mancuso, Carolyn Newberry Schwartz, Sean Noble, Tracey Occomy, Sylvia Puente, John Ranieri, Cathy Reed, Bonnie Roelle,

Guests: Bernard Cesarone (IECAM) and Moira O'Donovan (IFF)

Introductions and Brief Overview
The meeting was called to order at 2:10 pm by Tony Raden. Tony welcomed everyone and members introduced themselves. Tony provided a brief history of the committee's advisory role to the Capital Development Board (CDB) in developing the administrative rules and more recently the Release for Applications (RFA) for the Early Childhood Construction Grant Program (ECCGP). In preparation for the release of the RFA, an initial data discussion with CDB on how underserved communities with young children would be prioritized for funding was scheduled in January of 2011, but was put on hold by CDB when the state capital bill was determined unconstitutional by the Appellate Court. Directly following this ruling, the Governor's Office appealed to the Supreme Court and a stay was issued. While the final ruling is still uncertain, the Governor's Office has prioritized the ECCG Program and in early May the Governor's Office prompted a more recent data discussion. As a result, in a small group discussion with the co-chair, staffer and key state data experts from IFF, Chapin Hall and IECAM, CDB and Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) shared their initial data methodology. Given the lack of true facilities data and the inherent data limitations with the existing data, the group decided the proposed measure would need further analysis and additional review by the committee before a measure was finalized. As a result of this discussion, the CDB and ISBE asked the committee to develop a measure with the goal of providing a *simple, feasible and equitable measure* they could reproduce.

Data Methodology Discussion
Given this charge, data experts from IECAM and IFF developed data resources to help guide the Committee in making their final decisions. These resources were shared with the committee members and can be found on the following website: http://web-test.crc.uiuc.edu/cdb/. Tony

noted that while these data resources will help guide the committee's decisions, given the lack of true facilities data, there is no clear right or wrong data process to guide these policy decisions. Bernard Cesarone from IECAM and Moira O'Donovan from IFF guided the overall data methodology discussion with a Power Point presentation and additional handouts. Informed by the statute, the draft RFA and our previous data discussion, IECAM and IFF provided insights and resources that enabled the Committee to focus on the following key questions:

- Which early education and care programs should be included in a formula calculating "supply" within communities?
- Which population of children should be prioritized?
- Should an absolute or relative index be used?
- How should Chicago be compared to the rest of the state?

Given these questions and data resources, the Committee discussed and where noted, voted, on the following recommendations.

Data Recommendation 1 - Which early education and child care programs should be included in the formula?
To determine the methodology for calculating children "served" in a given community, IECAM and IFF recommended that the state utilize early childhood program and child care data collected annually by IECAM. As a whole, the committee agreed that the following supply data should be included: Head Start/Early Head Start, PreK/Preschool for All, Licensed Child Care Centers and License Exempt Child Care Centers.

After a discussion on if Licensed Family Child Care Homes should be included in this formula, the committee voted to not include data on the number of children in Licensed Family Child Care Homes. The majority of committee members felt that including Licensed Family Child Care Homes could under represent the need for facilities and center-based care in many communities.

Data Recommendation 2 - Which population of children should be prioritized? (i.e. all children 0 to age 5 or all children 0 to age 5 <200% of Federal Poverty Level)
After some initial discussion on whether to include families above the 200% FPL, the committee voted to prioritize facility grants for communities with the greatest need for early care and education services for low-income children in families at or below 200% for the FPL.

Data Recommendation 3 - Should an absolute or relative index be used?
After extensive discussion on the number of ways to calculate community need using one or a combination of the absolute or relative index, the committee agreed to endorse a combination of both absolute (slot gap or number of children not served) and relative (percentage of children served) measures to prioritize community need. The committee then focused the next decision on what weighted scale to use. At the conclusion of this discussion, the majority of committee members were in favor of a weighting scale of 75% absolute and 25% relative. But before signing off on a formal endorsement, members requested to see the results that the 75/25% formula would produce when applied to ranking of municipalities across the state and Chicago

neighborhoods. As a result, IECAM will develop these rankings and share them via email with the committee for final approval.

Data Recommendation 4 - How should Chicago be compared to the rest of the state?
The statute stipulates that the Chicago Public Schools will distribute 20% of the total funding for Chicago and CDB will distribute 80% to the remainder of the state. Given that Chicago providers will be eligible to apply for funding through both agencies and allocations, the Committee briefly discussed how individual Chicago neighborhoods could be ranked in relation to cities across the state. Committee members briefly discussed the following two options.

- The first option would separate rankings for municipalities and Chicago neighborhoods. While this method keeps distinct and dissimilar geographical entities separate, it would also require an additional multi-step process for determining priority communities.
- The second option is to create one uniform ranking system. This is based on an assumption that neighborhoods and cities are sufficiently comparable to allow for meaningful comparisons in prioritizing funding.

The committee ran out of time before any voting could take place on this recommendation. As a result, the committee decided to follow up with committee members via email.

Next Steps
Tony explained that there will be a follow up email to the committee members regarding data recommendations 3 and 4 noted above for final input. In addition, the final recommendation to CDB will include;
- A recommendation that the early childhood construction grant program be distributed in two phases to allow time for communities and providers to benefit from an alignment with the ARRA Early Childhood Care and Education Grant funding; and
- Given the ongoing data limitations and the unprecedented processes and elements required of this new capital program, an analysis be undertaken of applications received during a first round of funding to determine if funds are being distributed effectively and equitably to the most underserved communities across the state. This type of analysis could provide valuable insights to inform a second phase of funding.

The meeting concluded at 4:10 pm.